	·	2009 SEP -2 PM 12: 33
	UNITED:STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA HAMMOND DIVISION	FOR This C
TIMINELE  VS.  UNITED STA  U.S. Sheel	(Plaintiff) )	. V . 2 6 6
<del></del>	MPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT	
Plaintiff brings discrimination as set f	a complaint against defendant <u>United States Steet</u> orth below.	JU.S.Steel
Plaintiff	ODESDOES NOT (indicate which) demand a	jury trial.
	L PARTIES	
Plaintiff's Name:	TIM WRIGHT	
Plaintiff's Address:	3407 Kenward St. Hammond, IN 46323	
Plaintiff's Telephone	1.69-7897	
Defendant's Name:	UNITED States Skel Corp C/O	Jenna Rogen
Defendant's Address:	0.0.1.00	,
•	II. BASIS OF CLAIM AND JURISDICTION	
1. This complaint	is brought pursuant to:	
	II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C tion is based on 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1343(a);	2. §2000e-5), and

	The Age Discrimination in Employment Act (29 U.S.C. §621), and jurisdiction is based on 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1343(a);				
	The Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. §12101), and jurisdiction is based on 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1343(a);				
	The Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. §701, et seq.), and jurisdiction is based on 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1343(a);				
	Equal rights under law (42 U.S.C. §1981), and jurisdiction is based on on 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1343(a);				
	Other (list):				
2.	Plaintiff DID DID NOT (indicate which) file a charge of discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or the Indiana Civil Rights Commission. [If the plaintiff did file a charge of discrimination, Plaintiff should attach a copy of the charge to the complaint].				
3.	Plaintiff's Right to Sue Notice from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or the Indiana Civil Rights Commission was RECEIVED on or about MAY 30, 200 (insert date the plaintiff received the notice — in most instances this will not be the same date stamped on the notice). [Plaintiff should attach a copy of the Notice of Right to Sue to this complaint.]				
	III. STATEMENT OF LEGAL CLAIM				
	Plaintiff is entitled to relief in this action because (if more space is needed, attach				
additi	ional pages): See a Hached				
	DISABILITY DISCRIM, NATION				
	PERCEIVED DISABILITY "				
	FAILURE to ACCOMODATE				
	IV. FACTS IN SUPPORT OF COMPLAINT				
please	The facts on which this complaint is based are the following (if you need additional space, e attach additional pages)  See a Hached				

(Facts, continued)
V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF
Based on the foregoing, plaintiff seeks the following relief:
See a Hached
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
VL AFFIRMATION OF PLAINTIFF
I, <u>TIM</u> , the plaintiff in the aforementioned cause, do affirm that I have read all of the statements contained in the complaint and those which are attached in the accompanying financial statement. I believe them to be, to the best of my personal knowledge, true and correct.
Further, I do understand that this complaint and this affidavit will become an official part of the United States District Court files and that ANY FALSE STATEMENTS knowingly made by me are llegal and may subject me to criminal penalties.
(Signature of Plaintiff)
(Daté)

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA HAMMOND DIVISION

TIM WRIGHT,	)
Plaintiff	)
vs.	) CASE NO.
UNITED STATES STEEL CORP	. )
Defendants	)

## III. Legal Claim

- Tim Wright was employed by Defendant until his suspension.
- 2... Plaintiff TIM WRIGHT is a qualified person with a disability, depression, and was perceived by Defendant as having a disability. Defendants, through their officers and managers, have been aware of Plaintiff's disability for a considerable amount of time and have perceived Plaintiff to be disabled.
- 3. Plaintiff TIM WRIGHT was able to perform all of the duties of his position with or without accommodation.
- 4.. However, Defendants unlawfully discriminated against the plaintiff on the basis of perceived disability by subjecting him to a psychological evaluation.
- 5. Defendant further had this "evaluation" performed by a psychiatrist not licensed to practice in the state of Indiana.
- 6. As a result of said fraudulent evaluation, it was determined that Plaintiff was not able to perform his duties or duties other than mundane tasks.
  - 7. As a result of this perceived disability, Plaintiff has been deemed unable to work for

Defendant.

- Defendant has thus determined Plaintiff be disabled so severely that he cannot peform duties without reasonable accommodation.
  - 9. However, Plaintiff currently performs the same or similar duties for another company.
- 10. Further, although Plaintiff has a history of depression, but is able to work with or without reasonable accommadation, including job reassignment, which would have posed no undue burden upon the employer.
- 11. Though Plaintiff has depression, and Defendant has deemed Plaintiff to be disabled but has offered no reasonable accommodation such as job reassignment or adjustment of duties, although the same is available and Plaintiff expressed interest in the same.
- 12. As a result of the foregoing actions, plaintiff has been damaged, has been unable to find comparable employment with comparable income and benefits and has thus, sustained a loss of income and loss of benefits, has sustained emotional distress and will sustain a future loss of income and future loss of benefits.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff TIM WRIGHT prays for judgment in hisfavor and against the Defendant, and prays this court award back pay and benefits, front pay and front benefits, compensatory and punitive damages to the extent allowable by law, attorney's fees, expert fees and court costs.

EEOC Form 161 (2/08)

## U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

I	DISMISSAL AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS					
/ 34	mmy Wright 07 Kenwood St ammond, IN 46323	From:	Indianapolis District Office 101 West Ohio St Suite 1900 Indianapolis, IN 46204			
		rson(s) aggrieved whose identity is L (29 CFR §1601.7(e))				
EEOC C	harge No.	EEOC Representative	Telephone No.			
		Philip E. Moore,	(047)			
	08-03562	Enforcement Supervisor	(317) 226-7273	_		
THE E	7	E ON THIS CHARGE FOR THE FOLLO	, 1			
	The facts alleged in the	charge fail to state a claim under any of the s	statutes enforced by the EEOC.			
	Your allegations did not involve a disability as defined by the Americans With Disabilities Act.					
	The Respondent employs less than the required number of employees or is not otherwise covered by the statutes.					
~	Your charge was not timely filed with EEOC; in other words, you waited too long after the date(s) of the alleged discrimination to file your charge					
X	The EEOC issues the following determination: Based upon its investigation, the EEOC is unable to conclude that the information obtained establishes violations of the statutes. This does not certify that the respondent is in compliance with the statutes. No finding is made as to any other issues that might be construed as having been raised by this charge.					
	The EEOC has adopted	the findings of the state or local fair employr	ment practices agency that investigated this charge.			
	Other (briefly state)					
		- NOTICE OF SUIT RIGH (See the additional information attached to				
notice o federal	f dismissal and of your rig aw based on this charge i notice; or your right to sue	ht to sue that we will send you. You min federal or state court. Your lawsuit it	ination in Employment Act: This will be the ornay file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) und must be filed WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receing time limit for filing suit based on a state claim manual.	der ipt		
alleged		means that backpay due for any violat	within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of t tions that occurred more than 2 years (3 years			
Englasy		On behalf of the Com	MAY 2 9 2009			
Enclosur	es(s)	Danny G. Harter, / Director	(Date Mailed)			
cc:	Jenna I Bager	Robin	Remley, Esq.			

Staff Supervisor, Labor Relation **UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION** One North Broadway Gary, IN 46402-3199

Law Offices of Robin Remley LLC 900 Ridge Road, Suite T Munster, IN 46321